

NOTE ii *CHILDREN OF LIVING PARENTS IN RITUAL* 237

perfectly with his theory: the Flamen, the Flaminica, and their youthful ministers were all rendered incapable of performing their sacred duties by the taint or corruption of death.

But a closer scrutiny of the argument reveals a flaw. It proves But the too much. For observe that in these Greek and Roman offices <sup>rule which</sup> held by boys and girls the disqualification caused by the death of a <sup>^hcms</sup> parent is necessarily lifelong, since the bereavement is irreparable, from ceremony. Accordingly, if Dr. Farnell's theory is right, the ceremonial pollution taint sacred which is the cause of the disqualification must also be lifelong; in cannot be other words, every orphan is ceremoniously unclean for life and based on thereby excluded for ever from the discharge of sacred duties. So a theory sweeping a rule would at a stroke exclude a large, if not the larger, <sup>^eVere-</sup> part of the population of any country from the offices of religion, <sup>menially</sup> and lay them permanently under all those burdensome restrictions <sup>unclean</sup> which the pollution of death entails among many nations; for <sup>the°death</sup> obviously a large, if not the larger, part of the population of any of their country at any time has lost one or both of its parents by death, <sup>parents.</sup> No people, so far as I know, has ever carried the theory of the ceremonial pollution of death to this extremity in practice. And even if it were supposed that the taint wore off or evaporated with time from common folk so as to let them go about their common duties in everyday life, would it not still cleave to priests? If it incapacitated the Flamen's minister, would it not incapacitate the <sup>Flarnen</sup> himself? In other words, would not the Flamen <sup>Dialis</sup> be obliged to vacate office on the death of his father or mother? There is no hint in ancient writers that he had to do so. And while it is generally unsafe to argue from the silence of our authorities, I think that we may do so in this case without being rash; for Plutarch not only mentions but discusses the rule which obliged the Flamen Dialis to resign office on the death of his wife,<sup>1</sup> and if he had known of a parallel rule which compelled him to retire on the death of a parent, he would surely have mentioned it. But if the

ceremonial pollution which would certainly be caused by the death of a parent did not compel the Flamen Dialis to vacate office, we may safely conclude that neither did the similar pollution caused by the death of his wife. Thus the argument adduced by Dr. Farnell in favour of his view proves on analysis to tell strongly against it.

But if the rule which excluded orphans from certain sacred Examples offices cannot with any probability be explained on the theory of  $\wedge\wedge\{\wedge$  their ceremonial pollution, it may be worth while to inquire whether of orphans another and better explanation of the rule cannot be found. For from sacred that purpose I shall collect all the cases of it known to me. The offices\_ collection is doubtless far from complete: I only offer it as a starting-point for research.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanac*, 50.